NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III. SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1834. NO. 26.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (foot of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

Original.

JUSTICE AND MERCY.
A Sermon,
BY I. D. WILLIAMSON.

Also unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou renderest unto every man according to his works. Psalm lxii, 12.

There is a sentiment usually expressed in a simple sentence, which on account of its frequent use, has grown to be a kind of proverb, the truth of which, no one thinks of disputing, more than he does one of the mathematical problems of Euclid. I refer to the trite and common saying, that, "A God, all mercy, is a God unjust." As this is a proverb in Israel, and may be heard full often from the D. D. and every intermediate grade, down to the humble exhorter, and as the sentiment it expresses, is intimately connected with the doctrine held forth in our text, it may be proper to give it a passing notice.

It often happens, that sayings of this kind, pass like a thief in disguise, and from their familiarity to every ear, they escape even a search from the officer of justice.

We use them as parrots use words, because we hear others use them, and are frequently ignorant of their meaning, never having even paused to inquire whether they have any meaning or not.

"A God all mercy, is a God unjust." Who said so? Why, every body says so; and what every body says, must be true.

A very summary way of deciding the great question "what is truth," indeed! But what do they mean by such an expression? Do they mean that the infinite and incomprehensible Jehovah, who filleth immensity with the boundless amplitude of his own all pervading presence, must be divided into fractions? Do they mean that he must be about half and half justice and mercy, in order to be a God? If this is not the meaning of the phrase, I confess I am at a loss to discover, that it has any meaning. At all events, it is evident that this proverb clearly recognizes the principal that justice and mercy are two contending principles, diametrically opposed, and that God is a kind of compound, composed of about equal parts of each, which mutually neutralize each other. If this view of justice and mercy is correct, then surely God cannot be just, but at the expense of his mercy, nor merciful, but at the expense of his justice. Here is the broad line of distinction, which separates justice from mercy. On the one side, all is justice without mercy, and on the other, all is mercy without justice. It is evident, then, that whenever God passes that line, he trespasses upon the claims of one or the other. If he does justice, he violates the principles of mercy, and if he does a merciful act, he trespasses upon the claims of justice. Upon this ground, God is neither infinite in mercy, nor perfect in justice. If he does a just act, it must be abated from his mercy, and if he does a merciful act, you must subtract the full amount from his justice.

This is placing God at variance with himself, and planting the standard of perpetual *war* between his attributes. At this rate, there will be no God soon, for a house divided against itself, cannot stand.

The use commonly made of the parable of the fig tree, is illustrative of the views which people entertain of justice and mercy.

They say, it was justice which cried "cut it down, cut it down;" but mercy said, "spare it yet a little longer."

Such are the common notions of justice and mercy, when applied to the subject of punishment for sin. The sinner stands justly exposed to all the miseries of this life, death itself, and the pains of hell, for ever. All men have sinned, and justice would long ago have consigned the whole race, to the shades of eternal despair, but mercy, the darling attribute, has been pleading, spare them "yet a little longer," and will continue her importunities till justice shall remit her claims upon a portion of the intelligent universe, and bless them for evermore.

Here you can see the wide and eternal distinction between justice and mercy, in the opinions of men. Justice demands endless pain, and *mercy* forbids the infliction of one stripe. Hence follows the conclusion, that "a God all mercy, is a God unjust." And hence, also, it is thought that God cannot punish the sinner as justice requires, and yet be merciful.

Directly opposed to this, stands the doctrine of the text. "Unto thee, O Lord! belongeth mercy, *for* thou *renderest* unto every man according to his works."

To render unto every man according to his works, is certainly according to the dictates of strict impartial justice; and the hearer will observe, that the fact of God's practice upon this principle, is given by the Psalmist, as *the reason* or the evidence that God is merciful. The doctrine of the text, is evidently this, that the display of God's justice, in rewarding and punishing men according to their works, is an evidence of God's mercy.

The doctrine may appear strange to those who have been in the habit of associating with the words *justice* and *mercy*, an idea of two principles, utterly repugnant to each other; and it shall be my business in this discourse, to explain this doctrine, and show that punishment to the full amount of crime, and according to the dictates of strict justice, perfectly accords with the exercise of tender mercy.

It will be necessary for us, in the prosecution of our subject, to obtain some clear and definite ideas of justice and mercy, the two great principles recognized in our text. One or two remarks of a general character, will prepare the way for a more minute and critical examination of the subject in hand, and

1. Justice and mercy, as used among men, are relative terms.

We call an act *just* or *merciful*, comparing it with the laws of the land in which we live, or the rules of society where we have been educated. What is just in one place, would be considered *merciful* in another, and perhaps *cruel* in a third. Thus: To crop and brand a man for a petty theft, is thought to be *just* in one place, *merciful* in another, and *cruel* in a third. In those countries, where the laws inflict such a punishment it is thought to be just, that the thief should be whipped, have his ears cropped, and receive a mark in his forehead.

The same punishment is considered very *merciful*, by those who have lived where they hang for stealing, and *we* have long ago rejected it, as barbarous and cruel. From these remarks, you will perceive, that neither justice nor mercy, as applied to human actions, are measured by any unvarying rule, but, are relative terms given to things as they compare with the laws of the land, or the common rules of Society. Whether these rules, or these laws, are founded upon the eternal principles of equity and right, is another question, which the mass of mankind do not stop to agitate, and hence it happens that the sacred names of justice and mercy, are abused and perverted. In all cases; whatever punishment the law of the land, and the opinion of society, denounces against crime, is considered just, and the people can conceive of no mercy, but in the remission or mitigation of the sentence.

Without pausing to enquire whether the law itself is based upon those eternal principles of justice and mercy, which are the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; we conclude that laws, are all justice, and no mercy, and that the penalty of the law must of course, be remitted, in order to exercise mercy. The same course of reasoning, is applied to God's government. We commence with the position, That God's laws are arbitrary, and the penalty without mercy, and then we can find no room for mercy, when the law is executed.

All this originates in the fact that we confound *real justice* and mercy, with that which is only relative, and measure the justice and mercy of God, by the scanty line, which we apply to finite man.

We ought to reflect that the government of God is not tyranny; that its foundation is laid deep in those eternal principles of justice, mercy, truth and equity, which never change, and that in all its varied laws, there is no point or part which does not recognize these principles as its foundation and support. His justice is not measured by *past facto* rules, but it begins in justice and mercy, and ends with the same, and there is no clashing of principles, nor war of its primary elements. All is justice, and all is mercy. This leads me to remark

2. That the common notions of justice and mercy, confound the one with cruelty, and the other with weakness. Justice is not cruelty, nor is mercy weakness. The laws of God are *just*; the penalties attached are merciful; and it is not mercy, but weakness, which remits the punishment of a merciful law.

When God gave his law to man, he added to it no greater penalty than was consistent with tender mercy; hence the infliction of that penalty can never be opposed by the same mercy that dictated it at first.

Justice never required a more severe punishment, than is calculated to work the reformation of the offender, and such a punishment is required by mercy as well as by justice.

The difficulty in this matter originates in the

erroneous supposition, that justice requires an unmerciful punishment.

Men start with the position that the just punishment for sin is endless misery, and then contend that mercy is exhibited only in saving from this penalty. Now, it is not justice, but cruelty, which inflicts endless pain. Neither is it mercy which forbids the infliction of just punishment, but puerile weakness. I know that mercy weeps at the horrid idea of ceaseless woe, but what then? She weeps not at justice, but cruelty.

The parent who threatens to roast his child in a furnace, is cruel, and not just. But the parent who threatens his child with a just punishment, is weak and imbecile, if he does not inflict the full amount. With these general remarks, I proceed to a more critical examination of the subject, and inquire

1. *What is Justice?*

To this question, my reply is, that justice is that eternal and immutable principle of right, which in its practical operation, renders to every man, and every being, that which is properly *his* in the nature and fitness of things. I know of nothing but this, which deserves the name of justice.

I said that justice renders to every being their due. The question arises, how are we to decide what is due to every one? or by what criterion are we to determine what properly belongs to each being?

My answer is, that this criterion exists in the nature and fitness of things, and is developed in the relationship which exists between different individuals, and between the whole and one common father.

To illustrate this point, let us take a plain case. Here is a parent with a child. The parent is experienced in the world and capable of providing for his own welfare, whereas the child is ignorant and feeble. Out of this relationship, and these circumstances, two principles of justice are developed. In the nature of the case, there exists a propriety and necessity, that this child should yield itself to the direction of the father, and give obedience to his commands. It is right and proper, that the child should obey. Upon his obedience, the father has a claim. Now justice is that principle of right, which in its practical operation, gives to the parent the obedience of the child. But again, the parent has been the means of bringing that child into existence, and is the author of its dependant condition; hence appears another principle of justice. In the same nature and fitness of things, there exists a propriety and neccessity, that the parent should kindly watch over and protect the helpless child. To this care and protection, the child has a right, he claims it as his own, and justice is that principle which gives it to the child. It is easy to perceive that the criterion of judgment by which we determine what is due to each in this case, is no other than the nature of things, developed in the circumstances of the case.

The rule of justice, grows out of the relationship existing between the parties.

The same rule must be our guide in our inquiries relative to the justice of God. In order to find what is justice between God and man, for there must always be two or more parties concerned, it will be necessary to take into the account the relationship between the parties, and draw our principles of right and equity from that. What is that relationship?

I answer, God is our Father, and we are His children. He it was, that put forth the wonders of His power, and fashioned us from the dust. He it was, that breathed into our nostrils the breath of life, and made us live. We are all His offspring, and are commanded to call Him Father. We are ignorant, and He is wise. We are weak, but He is strong.

Hence it is fit and proper that we render obedience to His directions. He has a right to heartfelt obedience to all His laws, from all the vast family of man. This right grows out of His relation as a Father. He has acquired it by giving us existence, and providing for our wants, and it is clearly exhibited in the relation existing.

God claims our obedience as His due, and justice demands that He should have it.

On the other hand, man has a right to the care, protection and kindness, of his heavenly Father. This right grows out of the same source as the other.

Man did not create himself. God is the author of his existence. He made him weak, feeble, helpless, and dependant, and man had no hand in this matter. Hence there is a propriety and fitness, that God should protect and guide His helpless child. Man claims this as his own, and justice gives it to man. God has constituted man His child, and hence man has a natural and unalienable right to His protection, care, and kindness, and God Himself, cannot withdraw it without violating those principles of justice, of which He is the author, and which are as unchangeable as God Himself.

Here let it be remarked, that this right is absolutely unalienable. It is founded upon an immovable basis, and it never can be abrogated, as long as God is the Creator and man the creature. It is not a right which man has obtained by his own actions, and no act of his can make it forfeit. I know well enough that eminent divines tell us of the forfeited favor of God, and insist that we have no right to a blessing from His hands. But I know equally well, that such notions poorly harmonize with scripture, and more poorly still, with the voice of reason. The truth is, that children always have a right to the protection, care, and kindness, of their parents; and you may as well tell me that your little ones have no right to a blessing from your hand, as that man has no right to the favor of God.

He is our Father, and we are His children—and as such, we have an unalienable right to His care and kindness.

But you say, man has transgressed the laws of God, and thus forfeited His favor.

My reply is, That your children have often transgressed your commands, but they have not forfeited your favor by so doing. Your duty to your children, does not grow out of their moral characters, but it proceeds from that relationship which you have been the means of instituting. They are your children, and no act of theirs can abrogate this relation. You are their parents, and as such, inflexible justice demands kindness at your hands. True, they may be disobedient children, but they are *children* still, and as long as this is the fact, your duty is to do their good, and upon your favor, they have a claim founded in strict justice. So it is in relation to God. He is our Creator, and our Father, and as such, is bound by His own justice, to do us good. True, we may be disobedient children, but that does not alter our relationship to God. He is no less our Creator and our Father, on that account, and we have still a claim upon His protection.

Thus far we may proceed, and pronounce with assurance, that justice is that principle of right, which in its practical result, gives to God the obedience of all men, and to man, the kindness and protection of God, for in the nature of things, these claims are apparent.

We may now proceed one step further, and observe: That God has a right to enforce obedience by the infliction of punishment, when men go astray. It is evident, from the nature of the case, that the good of a child, requires that he should yield obedience to the laws of the parent. Now, parents have a right to punish children for their good. They have a right to inflict all that punishment which is necessary to produce obedience and no more. The parent has a claim founded in strict justice upon the obedience of the child, and when by the use of punishment the child becomes obedient, juctice is answered, and no man has a right to inflict another pang. So it is with God's justice. He has a claim upon his children for obedience. They transgress. He has a right to enforce obedience by the infliction of punishment.—When this end is answered justice is satisfied, and another pang cannot be inflicted without violating that principle of justice which guarantees to his offspring the care of a parent.

I am aware that these are different views of justice from those which are usually entertained upon the subject. I know that justice is represented as inflicting endless torment upon mankind without even a possibility of reforming or benefitting those on whose heads it falls. But if I know what is the meaning of the word *cruelty*, that is the proper word to apply to such proceedings. Every pain that is inflicted without a design of benefitting man is dictated by cruelty, and eternally at war with every principle of justice.

This is as far as it is necessary for us to pursue our inquiry in relation to justice. The remarks we have made, will hold good in all cases. Justice gives God the obedience of his children, and to man his protection. It recognizes in God the right of enforcing obedience, and of inflicting all that punishment which shall be necessary to reform the offender. We proceed to inquire

2. *What is mercy?*

According to the doctrine of our text an application of that same principle of right which we call justice. "Unto thee O, Lord, belongeth mercy, for thou renderest unto every man according to his works."

Unto thee belongeth mercy because thou art just, is the sentiment. Hence you will perceive that it is utterly impossible for any being to be just who is not merciful, or merciful who is not just—then I may safely say that mercy is an application of the same eternal principle of right which we call justice, and the only difference between justice and mercy is, *not* in the *principle*, but in the *manner* and circumstances of its administration.

When speaking of justice I remarked that a parent had a right to the obedience of his child, and the child a right to the protection of the parent, and that this right was developed in the relation between them and existed in the nature and fitness of things. I said that justice was that principle of right which rendered obedience to one and protection to the other.

Now you will recollect that the child is helpless, weak and ignorant, and his own best good requires that he should yield himself to the direction of a parent's experience. Now mercy certainly requires the parent to provide for and protect his helpless child. So also, because the good of the child requires that he should be obedient, the same merey demands that obedience, and *tender* mercy requires the parent to enforce it. Justice says to the child render to your father the obedience which is his, and mercy says the same. Hence it is evident that a merciful parent will enforce obedience.

Now when he employs punishment as a means of effecting submission we call it justice. When he employs the melting accents of love, we call it mercy, and yet it is evident that in both cases it is nothing more or less than an application of the same eternal principle of right, which renders to the parent obedience from the child.

I will illustrate our subject by the introduction of a case in point.

A man is walking the streets and he finds a helpless orphan famishing for food. He takes the child to his house and relieves its pressing wants. Now you may say if you please that

this was mercy in that man, it was so. But it was no less just than merciful. It was an application of that justice which gives to the friendless orphan a claim upon our charity.

A man finds his own child in the streets in like circumstances takes him home and treats him as he did the orphan. That was Justice. The man did his duty and practiced upon the principle that a child has a claim upon the parent for support. Yet it is easy to perceive that in both cases the man acted justly, and though we call one act just and the other merciful, yet it is evident that in both the man practiced upon the same rule of right, and the only difference was in the mode of its exhibition and the circumstances of the two cases.

To the one, the man stood related as a father, and discharged his duty as such. We call it justice. To the other he stood related as a fellow being to one in distress, and discharged his duty as a benefactor. We call it mercy; it was justice also, for it is no more true that the child has a claim upon his father than it is that the widow and orphan have a claim upon our charity. The former is more universally acknowledged, but the latter is no less binding. We call one justice and the other mercy, not because there is any difference in the original principles upon which the acts were founded, but only in the application of it to different circumstances.

Suppose now that when the parent had found his child, he should refuse to obey his parent and return. The parent takes the rod and inflicts pain. The child is obstinate and still refuses to return. We call that a display of Justice. It is so. It is an application of that principle of right which gives the parent a claim to obedience from the child. But what does mercy say? Does she pluck the trembling child from a father's hand and bid him go his way? No. She weeps over his obstinacy, but knows right well that the good of the child is involved. She sees the child is feeble and helpless, and without a father's care, will be poor and naked, upon the cold charity of the world, and her voice is heard saying, humble and subdue him or all is lost. The parent continues the chastisement, till the stubborn will is bent, and submission follows. The rod falls to the earth, and to a father's heart all the gems of Indies richest mines, are but dross compared with that tear of contrition, and the music of angels dull and insipid, compared with a penitent sigh from a returning prodigal. Oh! what unutterable joy fills the heart of a parent when he clasps in his arms, a repenting wayward boy, who was lost and is found, who was dead and is alive.—That act was merciful. It was just also, for justice requires kindness in parents. When the child became obedient the end of justice was satisfied, and the parent had no right to inflict another stripe, but was bound in justice to receive him kindly and love him fully. Justice and mercy both require that punishment should be inflicted until the child yielded obedience. When that object was effected, justice was satisfied, and mercy rejoiced. The infliction of stripes was the enforcement of a parent's right to obedience, and the reception of the child, the acknowledgment of the child's right to protection and care. Both were just and both were merciful.

Now for the application of this reasoning to the mercy of God.

He is our father and consequently has a right to our obedience to his holy laws. He displays his justice when he enforces this claim by the infliction of punishment. Man is a feeble, helpless, and dependent creature, and needs the direction of wisdom from above. Without it he wanders in darkness and doubt, a prey to all the ills of life, with no refuge from the storm, and no rock of defence.

The voice of his father calls after him in all the solicitude of parental kindness,

"My child, turn your feet in the way of wisdom, for her ways are pleasantness and her paths are peace. Hearken unto me and continue in my ways and I will make your defence the munition of rocks, and ye shall have abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth." Man heeds not the warning voice but continues in the downward way, whirling with fearful haste to the depths of misery and death.

What is it that flies to his relief and plucks him from the verge of the pit? What is it that plants herself in his way, and says, thus far shalt thou go and no further, and enforces obedience to the mandate of heaven with the rod? It is justice. Yes and it is mercy too. It was meek eyed mercy that prompted justice to her duty, and demanded her interposition to save a trembling mortal from impending ruin.

Unto thee O Lord! belongeth mercy, for thou renderest unto every man according to his works.

The conclusion at which I arrive from our subject is this. That all the punishment which God inflicts upon the children of men is amendatory. No other punishment is merciful, nor is any other just. Endless misery which precludes the possibility of ever reforming the transgressor, is utterly opposed to every principle of justice and mercy.

Men understand this subject well enough in its application to themselves. There is not a parent among you who does not know that every stripe he inflicts upon a wayward child, is dictated by the tenderest mercy, as well as by a sense of justice. But yet many are so blind, or so perverse, that they cannot see how there can be any mercy in the justice of God which punishes men. I will take a plain case which shall show you the mercy of God in rewarding men according to their works. It shall be the case of the drunkard. He lived till his health and reputation were gone and his substance wasted. A bloated nuisance in society he was cut down by the fell destroyer, and consigned to the silent tomb. You may stand by the unlettered stone on which the hand of affection, never wrote an epitaph that marks his grave, and trace the history of his life, from his commencement in sin to his destruction, and you will find it all marked with mercy and goodness.

When first he began to drain the intoxicating bowl, did not God inflict upon him the pains of an accusing conscience to warn him of his danger? When he had advanced another step, did not the red eye and the trembling hand come to tell him of his fate and admonish him to repent and live? When further still advanced did not disease and pain warn him to return to virtue and peace? These were the wages of his works, and at every point he was punctually paid as a solemn admonition to repent. This was the work of justice. It was done in mercy too, for thousands on thousands have been reformed by these means.

This man was not reformed. He lived till he was useless on earth and God in mercy took him hence, and from the grave he warns his fellows of their danger. Now my hearers, these chastisements, are the beacon lights which God in his mercy has placed on the ocean of life to warn the mariner when danger approaches. And they are as great an evidence of his mercy as can be presented in the history of human life. I close in the language of Scripture, "If my children forsake my law and walk not in my judgments, if they break my statutes and keep not my commandments, then surely will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquities with stripes, nevertheless my loving kindness I will not utterly take from them nor cause my faithfulness to fail."

Wisdoms ways are ways of pleasantness.

Original.

REFORMATION.

Reformation is a Scripture word, and was used by St. Paul, in speaking of the abolition of the ceremonial law, and the introduction of Christianity. Thus: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of *reformation*," Heb. ix, 10.

This may be called a doctrinal reformation; as the introduction of sounder doctrines into the church by the Reformers, is called, "the Reformation," in historical language.

But the return of the Israelites from idolatry and sin, is expressed by the word *reformed*. This was a practical reformation. And, indeed, the reformation in doctrine was designed to influence moral conduct, because doctrines have practical influences. Reformation, therefore, implies, to be made better in theory or practice, or both. Happy would it be for all, if they would consult their *Bibles* on these points, and be satisfied with its divine and salutary instructions. But those who neglect the testimony of heaven, and follow the caprices and whims of the ignorant, the superstitions, or the designing, in regard to these subjects, cannot rationally expect to find substantial peace and comfort of mind. As the fashions of priest-craft are continually changing, they will find themselves in a constant vertigo of opinion. Brethren and friends, let us be no more children, tossed to and fro, and *carried about* by every mind of doctrine, and the cunning craftiness of men, who lye in wait to deceive. But *believing* the truth, and *speaking* the truth in love, let us grow up in Him who is the HEAD,—unto the perfect stature of a new man, in Christ Jesus.

R. S.

Shirley Village, Mass.

Original.

CONVERSION.

It is important that we appeal directly to the law and the testimony, that we may understand the true and appropriate use of certain terms.

The word conversion, is found but once in the sacred volume, and then, denotes the prevalence of christianity among the Gentiles; "declaring the *conversion* of the Gentiles," Acts xv, 3. The word *convert*, and its *correlatives*, are used about a dozen times in the Bible; and sometimes denote a turning from one doctrine to another, and sometimes a change of moral habits and character, without direct reference to doctrines. To Peter it was said, "When thou art *converted*, strengthen thy brethren;" (Luke xxii, 32,) which related to the great change of sentiment, produced by the "great sheet," thrice let down from heaven, (Acts, 10th chap.) Again, "If any of you do *err* from the *truth*, and one *convert* him," &c., (James v, 19.) Conversion, in this instance, is produced by the arguments and persuasion of a brother, and implies a return or restoration to the truth.

But a change of disposition and moral character is more particularly implied, when it is said, "Except ye be *converted*, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of God;" and, "*repent* ye, therefore, and be *converted*, that your sins may be blotted out," Matt. xviii, 3. and Acts iii, 19.) Every errorist, and every sinner, needs conversion. And who is without errors, or sinless? But people of a child-like, teachable disposition, will turn from falsehood, when its abominations are exposed, and from iniquity, when conviction is produced, with sufficient clearness and pungency, from above. There is no mysticism in the Bible doctrine of conversion: Nothing like modern incantations on that subject. R. S.

Shirley Village, (Mass.)

[FOR THE MESSENGER AND UNIVERSALIST.]

A VINDICATION.

Br. PRICE—I have just read with deep surprise and regret an article on the last page of your 22d No. entitled "Temperance," and credited to the Ladies Repository; whether meaning the "Universalist and Ladies Repository," of Boston, I know not. I have never seen the piece in question in the above named Paper, but as I have missed No. 35, I think possibly *that* may have contained it, of which were I *certain*, I should choose to trouble Br. Smith, with the remarks which I feel it my duty to make, rather than yourself.

The writer, (probably the *Editor*,) speaks of the extract as a manly and eloquent composition, and thinks the sentiments relating to the example and influence of women deserves to be embodied in a work expressly designed for the ladies. Now with the utmost respect for the general opinions of our brother, and many thanks for the earnest wish he expresses that his fair readers may profit by Mr. Neal's gentle (?) hints, I must nevertheless entirely dissent from him in the opinion he entertains of the article in question.

I can discover no "*manliness*" in this Mr. John Neal's endeavoring to screen the guilty, by imputing their crimes to the innocent and defenceless. There is for *me* no "*eloquence*" in the harsh language he has chosen in charging females indiscriminately with being the "first great cause" of the deadly evil which has so long infested our unhappy country, and as for the article's being embodied in a work expressly for the edification of the ladies, I do trust, for the honor of my sex and human nature at large, that every female in the United States will spurn with honest indignation the unjust, the ungenerous aspersions which it so unsparingly heaps upon them. It is probable that this gallant (!!) writer remembered, while composing his manly address, that the age of chivalry was past, and that behind the breast-work of *power*, he could send down his slanderous darts among the writhing victims beneath, unendangered by an assault in return. But he may be assured that all championless and weak as we are, there are some among even *us*, that fear not to fling the glove of defiance at the feet of him, or any other person, who can thus wantonly abuse the spirit of long suffering and forbearance, and trample our purest and holiest feelings in the dust.

Reader, accuse me not of severity, till you have listened to the charges of this writer. After enumerating the various confederations of the male part of community to discourage intemperance both at home and abroad, he remarks; "It is not enough that we do all this if the wives, and mothers, and sisters of our country continue to make our very homes a snare to us; every sociable coming together, every fireside interview, and every joyous event an excuse for tampering with the shadow or playing with the skirts of the enemy." What an accusation! All our social parties then, our fireside interviews, our birth-day celebrations, which we had flattered ourselves tended to refine and polish the manners, to elevate the principles, and draw more closely the endearing ties of friendship and affection, all these Mr. Neal informs us are got up for the unhallowed purpose of debasing the morals of community, by encouraging a freer use of this poison of the soul. He does not even allow us the charitable shield of *ignorance*. No—our *motives* are impeached—all our little parties are but an "*excuse*" to entrap the feet of the unwary and "tamper with the skirts of the enemy." He continues, "as for what we may do—

We do but wear,
Our strength away in wrestling with the air,

So long as our women persist in pouring the fiery drug into the caudle-cup of the babe, mingling it with the food of the infant, substituting fever for health, and sorrow for strength, counterfeiting the stream of pearl, and hiding the treachery with flavor, and color, and perfume; for all these things are to be done before the youthful purity of taste can be perverted."—And do women do these things? Do they, or did they ever "persist" in mixing the fiery drug in the caudle of the babe, except as a medicine, at the recommendation of a Physician? I am confident they do not. I never heard of of such an instance. And to suppose that an infant of some 6 or 8 months of age should acquire such a love for ardent spirits, by having a few drops mixed with its Paregorick, as to become intemperate in after years in consequence, would be about as reasonable as to suppose that it would obtain a love of Tobacco, by inhaling the perfume of a Cigar. There is neither sense or truth in such assertions, and Mr. Neal in another place acknowledges that a child must be either worried or shamed into a liking for spirituous liquors, before he can overcome a natural loathing for their taste. And does he suppose there is a *mother*, in the whole universe, a MOTHER so degraded, so lost to maternal affection, so dead to every feeling of pride, humanity, or remorse, as to shame and worry a child into a love for that which she knew would prove, (nay, as Mr. N. carries the idea for the *express purpose* of proving,) its entire destruction?—Oh the thought is too preposterous, too shocking to be admitted. And grossly ignorant, or cruelly wicked, must be the heart that could insinuate such a thing. If children are trained to intemperance from infancy, I am convinced it is more by example than precept, for I cannot believe that even a father, a depraved and drunken father, could wantonly encourage his child in pursuing his own dark steps, much more a mother, whose very nature it is to seek in all cases the welfare of her offspring before her own.

Mr. Neal next enquires "what are we to do when we have under one pretext or another brandy mixed with our very food, our sauces, our jellies, our cakes, and our pies?" I think I can suggest an idea that may help him a little in this dilemma. If he be a husband, let him signify to Mrs. Neal that he does not relish the sauce so well with brandy in it, and a woman's word for it, if she is an obedient wife, (which as Mrs. *Neal*, she has undoubtedly *learned* to be,) she will so far consult the taste of her husband, that he will have no occasion to complain of his next dinner.

The last part of the address I shall copy entire. It begins and ends in a strain somewhat complimentary, and I think the previous remarks of the writer have prepared us to feel very grateful for any thing of this sort. It follows: "The women of our country, they who surround us with a living sunshine, with life and virtue, like an atmosphere—even they are chargeable, with perhaps a chief part of our present degradation, guilt, and sorrow. But for them, we never could have been what we are—a nation laboring with a fiery plague, that afflicts every twelfth of our number—and in the way of becoming a nation of drunkards. Not that they themselves are lovers of strong drink; but they it is, who have taught our fathers, ourselves, and our children to love it. Are they not the first and the chief teachers of men? And yet they sing of the red grape; they plant the vine about every path we tread in life—around our very household-gods; they offer the wine-cup to all that approach them, and they make little or no distinction, where they may, between the temperate and the intemperate, the dissolute and the virtuous.

"Do they recoil at the charge? It is true, nevertheless. Were they to do as they ought—were they to stand forth in their purity and power—were they to forbid the hope of the intemperate—were they to do no more than they may do, without reproach, they would reform posterity without the help of man.—Next to God, therefore, let us put our trust in woman—

"The hope of the nations—the bravest and best,
That e'er smote the plumage from tyranny's crest."

Here, reader, you have nearly the whole of this manly and eloquent composition before you, and was there ever a baser—a more cold blooded slander invented? Intemperance, with the whole dark catalogue of crimes attendant thereon, are attributed to the agency of females indiscriminately. *They* are held up to the world as spirits of darkness confederating together to drag the unwary down to perdition—as heartless syrens "who offer the wine-cup to all that approach them"—who sing of the red grape which without loving themselves they malignantly plant in the pathway of all around them, and who are so dead to every impression of virtuous morality that "they make little or no distinction between the temperate and intemperate—the dissolute and virtuous." Oh, what a picture! And must we bear all this in silence and submission? must we bow down our heads and say, mid our tears, "it is *us*, we may not answer." O we cannot do this, for if we should hold our peace it would seem that the very stones must cry out in our defence. We must see the other side of this picture.

Many indeed, and great have been the evils of intemperance, and *women* have been the chief sufferers. Is it not so? Whose hearts have ever bled most profusely at the ingratitude, the unkindness, and insensibility of the drunken man? Is it not the mother's, the wife's and the sister's? and is it reasonable to suppose that *they* would strive to perpetuate an evil that must necessarily perpetuate *their own* misery and disgrace? Is it not rather extremely irrational to suppose they would leave any opportunity unimproved of checking this destructive vice.—Women *have* made, and *do* continue to make, many efforts to suppress intemperance. Thousands of instances in history and every-day observation, prove this beyond a doubt. Is not the voice of the watchful mother ever the first to warn the reckless son of his danger? Are not her gentle admonitions poured incessantly in his ear, and her prayers offered daily at the throne of mercy, for his reformation? And the devoted wife, whose fate has been unfortunately linked with that of a dissipated husband, does she make no effort to uncoil the deadly viper from his heart? Does she "offer him the wine-cup?" Oh, listen to her tearful entreaties; mark her affectionate forbearance under the most aggravated abuse, lest otherwise the spell of darkness should increase; witness her untiring exertions to make her fireside pleasant, that he may prefer it to the loathsome grog-shop; observe the smile of cheerfulness she assumes to greet his return from the midnight revel, even while her wrung heart is almost bursting with intense agony; and behold her at last when every hope of reclaiming him has vanished, turning to her little ones for comfort, and striving, and frequently succeeding, in raising them (in spite of the example of a depraved sire,) through the mists of poverty and disgrace to honor and respectability in the world.

Such instances are not at all uncommon, and I could, if time and room permitted, mention many other ways in which women exert themselves to the utmost to suppress intemperance. They do much—all that they can in reason and prudence—and they sometimes go beyond these. Yes they many of them allow their zeal in the cause to outstrip their wisdom. I allude to their putting their names to temperance papers and the like. I repeat it, women have done, and continue to do, much to suppress intemperance, and I believe nothing to encourage it, Mr. Neal

to the contrary notwithstanding. *They do much*, and were men to exercise one half the self-denial, in subduing in their own breasts this most degrading propensity, that women do zeal in counteracting its dreadful effects, Mr. Neal would probably have had no occasion to calumniate so cruelly the female character, nor you, Br. Price, to open your columns for its defence, by one who is a *sincere friend to* TEMPERANCE, and also, A TRUE FRIEND TO HER SEX.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1834.

☞ Severe illness for a few days past has prevented that attention, or notice, of the communication, on our fourth page, from "*A True Friend to her Sex*," which the circumstances of the case may seem to call for. We are only answerable, it is true, for transferring the subject of complaint to our columns. But even in reference to this, from our health and the state of our paper, we can now only briefly observe—that we fear our fair correspondent has entirely misapprehended the "motives" of Mr. Neal, as also those of Br. Smith, in his introductory remarks. This *is* the case, or *we* have not rightly understood them ourselves, for we copi the article under very different impressions. We cannot persuade ourselves that the writer would for a moment attach to "females indiscriminately"—to *mothers* in particular, so revolting a character as that of willfully and deliberately perverting the natural taste of fathers, husbands, and children, with "strong drink," that they may go "down to the chambers of death—*drunkards* and *beasts*." We are aware he used strong and energetic language, but we supposed it a *strength* and *energy*, designed, in kindness, to arouse the (apparently) slumbering attention of *mothers* to a custom, which our correspondent, we think, will not deny has been of wide extent, and of long continuance. We mean the mixing of ardent spirit with the food and drink of children. Not that we can conceive for a moment, of a mother, who would "persist" in this, were there the most distant apprehension in her own mind of its leading to drunkeness and ignominious death, with her offspring. A *mother!* no—never! for she who could do it, would forever forfeit all claim to that endearing title, and even to the general respect due her sex.

We need not, perhaps, extend these remarks. The views we had of the article are probably understood. But our respected correspondent it seems understood them in a different light, and thus understanding them, we are gratified that she hesitates not to come out fearlessly in defence of herself and sex, under supposed injustice, and we most cheerfully give place to her article. Perhaps a re-examination of the subject may impress her differently. If it does not, we again express it as our opinion that the writer, or Br. Smith, did not intend to be thus understood, and that they can only be regarded unfortunate in the choice of language to convey their ideas, as we, in the selection of articles for our columns. P.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

[From the Philadelphian of April 16]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas —Letter 6.

Philadelphia, April 16, 1834.

Dear Sir—If '*reconiliation* always supposes *unreconciliation*,' then it is manifest that the ALL THINGS to be reconciled are to be understood as not meaning ALL THINGS absolutely. If there are some things not to be reconciled, then you and I have come to this agreement, *that it pleased the Father that in Christ all fullness should dwell, and having made peace thro' the blood of his cross by him to reconcile* ALL THINGS *unto himself, that are to be reconciled, or ever will be reconciled by him.* You affirm, however, that not *all things* absolutely, but all unreconciled human *persons* shall be reconciled. This I deny, for some die in their sins; have never forgiveness; never see life; but the wrath of God abideth on them, after they go to their own place.

You refer the whole of Matt. xxiv, to the coming of Christ to judge the Jews and Jerusalem; and think it is in this life alone that we are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ. In the third verse of that chapter it is recorded, after Jesus had predicted the destruction of Jerusalem, that his disciples came to him on the mount of Olives, saying, 'Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?' These questions Christ answered. From the 4th to the 35th verse he gives the signs of his coming to judge Jerusalem; and tells them that 'this generation," to wit, of Jews, or Hebrews, 'shall not pass till all these things shall be fulfilled.' True it is, also, that all then living did not pass to their graves before Jerusalem was destroyed; and equally true that this generation of Jews still exists in a state of dispersion. In the 36th verse Jesus begins to answer the question concerning 'the end of the world,' saying, 'BUT OF THAT DAY' a different day from that of his coming to judge Jerusalem of which he had before spoken—'of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.' He proceeds to say concerning this last 'coming of the Son of man,' that it shall be sudden and unexpected as his coming in the days of Noah, by the judgment of the deluge. He exhorts to watchfulness in relation to the coming of *that day*, and assures us concerning each unfaithful and unwise servant that his Lord 'shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with hypocrites'—'where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

I freely confess that I believe in the existence of *devils*, and that in the time of our Savior's residence on earth, many devils peculiarly possessed some sinful mortals; and that by compelling them to confess Jesus Christ, while they dreaded and hated him, God the Father was glorified. Freely I confess, too, that I believe in other *holy angels* than merely *human messengers* dwelling on earth, in flesh; and yet I admit that *any one sent* on any errand whatever, may be called *an angel*.

You incidentally quote Heb. ii, 9, as evidence that Christ will reconcile all men to himself so as to save them. 'We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every *man*.' The word man is not in the original. He tasted death (*huper pantos*) *for every* ——; leaving some noun in the masculine gender to be supplied from the context. What that noun is the next verse shows. 'For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many SONS unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering.' Hence we see that the word *son* is to be supplied after *pantos* thus, 'that he by the grace of God should taste death for every *son*;' that he might bring many sons to glory. If, however, we admit that Christ tasted death for every human being, it will not follow that all will be saved from hell. He may have tasted death for every man, so as to have obtained the right of raising every man from the dead in the last day. He may have *tasted death for every man*, so as to become in his Mediatorial character Lord of all men. He died for all men in some sense, without dying to *save* all men from impenitence and ruin.

The *Michael* named in Daniel xiith, is taken to be the *Angel of the Covenant*; the Jehovah sent, or the Lord Jesus Christ himself; so that his standing up for the children of his people at that *time of trouble* to all the wicked, which shall exceed all former times of trouble, is no proof that the day of judgment will not then have come, in which some shall awake to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

You think I have either misquoted or misinterpreted Rom. ii, 7. The first ten verses of that chapter convey to my mind the most explicit declaration of a retribution future to the present life. 'Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest, doest the same things.' If a man has knowledge and conscience enough to judge his neighbor, he thereby evinces the righteousness of condemning him, when he does the very things which he condemns in others. 'But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth, against them which commit such things. And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance, and long-suffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man, according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor an immortality; eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness; indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish; upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God.'

Here the apostle teaches, 1st, *that there is a day of wrath and of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God coming*; against the coming of which men may *treasure up* wrath. If all their wickedness is punished as it is committed, they treasure up nothing against any day of wrath to be subsequently revealed. 2d. That in this day of wrath, when his righteous judgment shall be revealed, God WILL RENDER unto every man according to his deeds.—3dly. That in rendering unto every one according to his deeds, God *will render* ETERNAL LIFE, GLORY, HONOR, and PEACE, to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honor, and immortality. If men do not by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality, it is implied that HE WILL NOT render to them *eternal life*. 4thly. That in the day of the revelation of his righteous judgment, HE WILL RENDER to them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but do evil, the righteous retribution of *indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish*. 5thly. That this retribution both of the good and bad is to be *universal*, when the day of wrath and judgement shall be revealed; equally respecting the Jews and Gentiles. Were it true that God now renders full and perfect retribution, there would be no occasion for promising what *he will do* on a future day, yet to be revealed.

Other matters about which we have severally expressed our opinions already, I consent to leave to the judgment of our readers. I proceed to adduce further proof of a future state of punishment, which some of the human family shall experience.

Jehovah says, 'I will not justify the wicked.'—Exod. xxiii, 7. Of course God will *condemn* the wicked. The Lord 'will keep the feet of his saints and the wicked shall be silent in darkness.' 1 Sam. ii, 9. Here the destiny of saints and the wicked is contrasted; and this silence in darkness I take to be a description of interminable gloom and despair.—'The wicked is reserved to the day of destruction. They shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.' Job xxi, 30. If the *present life* is the day of destruction, and the day of wrath, I see not how the wicked are reserved in this life to a future day of punishment. If they are punished invariably as they do wickedly, and pass along in life, there is no *reserving* of them to the day of destruction and wrath. If the *destruction* to which the wicked is *reserved* is merely natural death and all are saved so soon as they die, then this text instead of being a solemn threatening, as it was evidently intended to be, becomes a precious assurance that the wicked is *reserved to salvation*. This I know comports with your views, but it seems to me a most manifest contradiction of all those passages which promise *good to the righteous*, and by way of contrast, denounce *evil to the wicked*. If *perishing* and *perdition* mean but a passage through death into heaven, why should the Scriptures continually represent the character and destiny of two classes of persons as widely different? Of the wicked it is said, 'Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castest them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! they are utterly consumed with terrors,' Ps. lxxiii, 18. 19. Now if all at death enter immediately into the perfect bliss of heaven, then the righteous and the wicked are alike set in slippery places, and need not fear being cast down into destruction and consumed with terrors; for the sooner they are cast down, destroyed, and consumed, the sooner they arrive at perfect happiness! Judas, according to this theory, was a happy man, and enjoyed advantages superior to those of his fellow apostles, who toiled and suffered during many years after his ascension to bliss before they experienced the same honor.

Of him, however, the scriptures teach that having betrayed his Lord, he went and hanged himself; and probably the rope having broken, that 'falling headlong he burst asunder in the midst and all his bowels gushed out.' 'Judas by transgression fell' from the 'the ministry and apostleship'—'that he might go to his own place,' Acts i, 18. 25. *His own place* after he hung himself, was undoubtedly

the grave for his body. But whither went his soul? You teach that he was made holy and happy, immediately, in spirit, so that *his own place* for his immortal soul's residence was paradise. Happy man to be thus translated to the abode of the spirits of the just made perfect! But to the destruction of this theory Jesus called Judas 'the son of perdition; John xvii, 12; said he was 'LOST;' and added, 'The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had never been born,' Mark xiv, 21. We deem those accursed, lost, miserable forever, who die under the WOE of the only Savior and Judge of sinners. You think Judas was *blessed* perfectly, so soon as he strangled himself. It must have been a *blessed woe*, then which Christ pronounced on him; and thus you call evil good, and good evil. Finally, if Judas entered heaven at death, and has been perfectly happy ever since, and will continue so, through everlasting ages, it was a very good thing indeed for him to have been born; and he ought to contradict the Savior in this matter, through everlasting ages. I remain, dear sir, yours, with the best wishes for your salvation. EZRA STILES ELY.

To Mr. E. S. Ely.—Letter 6.

Philadelphia, April 21, 1834.

Dear Sir—That "*reconciliation* always supposes previous *unreconciliation*," is too obvious to require proof—and that "the stones of the street and the cattle of the hills" can never be reconciled to God, is equally obvious—for they never were and never can be *unreconciled*. When it is said, "It pleased the Father that in Christ should *all fullness* dwell," you do not suppose that all the fullness of irrational beings and of inanimate matter is referred to, but "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." So when it is written, "It pleased the Father to reconcile all things to himself," I understand the testimony to declare, that it is the purpose and pleasure of the Father to reconcile to himself *all the rational beings* that ever were, or ever will be, in a state of unreconciliation. The remarks in my last letter, together with the quotations from Campbell, Stuart, and the Bible, were intended to establish this position.

To the cited conclusion you object, because, to use your own words, "some die in their sins; have never forgiveness; never see life; but the wrath of God abideth on them, after they go to their own place." In this sentence you have given us isolated parts of four Scripture passages, to which *your opinion* of their reference is appended, without attempting to show that they have the slightest bearing on the point in debate. I am aware that those passages are applied to the future state, and that they are deemed conclusive on the subject of our controversy, by a majority of the christian community. But I am also sensible that the question before us is not to be determined by ballot. So soon as you attempt to prove that the texts you have partially quoted stand in opposition to the final reconciliation of all mankind, I will attend to your reasoning.

In endeavoring to destroy the force of my remarks on Matt. xxiv, and parallel passages, you allow that from the 4th verse to the 35th, "Jesus gives the signs of his coming to destroy Jerusalem." But you add, "In the 36th verse Jesus begins to answer the question concerning the 'end of world,' saying, 'BUT OF THAT DAY,' a different day from that of his coming to judge Jerusalem," &c. I should be pleased to learn your reasons for supposing that "*a different* day" is referred to. In Luke xvii, 24—36, the deluge and the destruction of Sodom are undoubtedly spoken of, as illustrative of the sudden and unexpected coming of the Son of man to destroy Jerusalem—and until you present some proof to the contrary, I shall be justified in assuming that the same is true of the deluge as mentioned in Matt. xxiv, 37 et seq.—especially as the passages are confessedly parallel.

You may perhaps be disposed to rest your proof on the phrase "end of the world." In my remarks on the parable of the tares, in a former letter, I endeavored to show that the phrase *sunteleias tou aionos* signifies, not the end of the *material world*, but *the end of the age*. And I quoted the scriptures in proof of the position. The testimony of your own commentators was added by way of confirmation. As you have hitherto neglected to notice this important branch of our discussion, I beg leave respectfully to suggest that it be now attended to. It should not be forgotten that Jesus appeared in the *end of the world*, (*sunteleia ton aionon,*) to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix, 26. See also 1 Cor. x, 11. I sincerely hope that your next letter will contain your reasons for supposing that I have erred in the interpretation given of the phrase in question. I also desire you to furnish your reasons for applying *any* part of Matt. xxiv, to the concerns of a future life.

In your confession of belief "in the existence of devils," you give us to understand, that God may be glorified by an *extorted* acknowledgment of Jesus Christ! You say, "In the time of our Savior's residence on earth, many devils peculiarly possessed some sinful mortals; and that by compelling them to confess Jesus Christ, while they dreaded and hated him, God the Father was glorified." According to this statement, *devils* COMPELLED *sinners* to speak the truth—(which was rather out of character in any one connected with *the father of lies*)—and God the Father was glorified by an extorted confession of Jesus Christ, coming from the lips of those who dreaded and hated him! In *my* view, Sir, the Supreme Being can only be glorified by a sincere and heart-felt acknowledgment of the truth, based in the conviction of the understanding.

As to the two men possessed of demons, who confessed that Jesus was the Son of God, they were unquestionably persons of disordered minds, who had heard of the fame and miracles of the Messiah. They were soon restored to the proper use of their intellect, and sat at the feet of Jesus in their right mind. The popular superstition which supposes that fallen angels ever possessed any human kind, is equally destitute of foundation with the traditionary error of the Jews, namely, that the spirits of dead men inhabited the bodies of the living.

It is true that the word *man* is not in the original of Heb. ii, 9, but I cannot agree that the word *son*, as a substitute, would express the meaning of the Apostle, nor do I think it would accord with the scope of the context. My reasons are as follows:

We are certified that "the head of *every man* is Christ," 1 Cor. xi, 3, in which passage the pen of inspiration has not omitted a word, to be supplied by individuals to whom the record might descend. If Christ be the *head of every man*, it is reasonable to suppose that he *tasted death for every man*.

In 1 Tim. ii, 6, it is written of Jesus, that he "gave himself a ransom for ALL (*huper panton*) to be testified in due time." In verse 4th we read, that God our Savior "will have ALL MEN (*pantas anthropous*) to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." If you allow that the *will* here mentioned is a determinate purpose of the Almighty, then the doctrine I have engaged to sustain is established. If you allege that it is simply a will of *desire*, you must either allow that Jesus gave himself a ransom for all men absolutely, which is equivalent to tasting death for every man; or attempt to show how God can desire the salvation of any for whom Jesus did *not* give himself a ransom.

If Jesus did *not* give himself a ransom for all men—then, upon your own grounds, it is *impossible* that *all men* should be saved. This will run you into the doctrine of the "Confession of Faith," namely, that the number of angels and men elected from all eternity to everlasting life, "is so *definite* and *certain* that it cannot be either *increased* or *diminished*." In this case, you will explain your reasons for calling on *all men to believe*, with the assurance that all men *may be* saved.

There would be no impropriety in reading Heb. ii, 9, thus: "That he by the grace of God should taste death for ALL."

The context of the passage cannot, in my judgment, justify any other than the foregoing interpretation. "Thou hast put ALL THINGS (*panta*) in subjection under his feet. For in that he put ALL (*ta panta*) in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. [God excepted, as in 1 Cor. xv, 27, and as some old MSS. read on the text under examination, "that he should taste death for ALL, God excepted."] But now we see not yet ALL THINGS (*ta panta*) put under him." I ask whether it is reasonable to suppose that the Apostle, after penning this explicit testimony, should intend to say that Jesus did not taste death for the *all things* to be put in subjection under him?

Your principal argument is drawn from the fact that "*many* SONS" are spoken of in the 10th verse. But this special reference to those who had already been brought into subjection to Christ, must not be misunderstood to militate against the universal subjection previously declared. The Apostle had stated expressly, that the disciples did not yet see all things subdued to the Messiah—but the train of his reasoning shows that this universal subjection would certainly be accomplished. The "many sons" who had been bro't to glory were the first fruits—as in verse 11; "for both he that sanctifieth and they who ARE sanctified are all of one." So in 1 Cor. vi, 9—11, after mentioning a number of evil characters, and declaring that such should not inherit the kingdom of God, the Apostle adds, "Add such *were* some of you: but ye *are* washed, but ye *are* sanctified."

Indeed the verse in which the "many sons" are spoken of confirms the foregoing view of the subject. "For it became him, for whom are ALL THINGS, (*ta panta*) and by [through] whom are ALL THINGS, (*ta panta*) IN BRINGING *many sons* unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." *When* was Jesus made perfect through suffering? Plainly, "*in bringing many sons*," the first fruits of *all things*, "to glory." It is written, Rom. xi, 36, 'For of him, and through him, and *to him*, are all things." Do you suppose that Jesus still suffers? Do you suppose he is not yet made perfect? To be brief: In my judgment, Jesus *was made* perfect "*in bringing many sons* to glory;" that in his mediatorial character he is Lord of all; and that, by him, God will reconcile all things to himself.

In Rom. viii, the same Apostle presents testimony in confirmation of the above view of the subject. He speaks of the *sons*, the children, who had *already* received the spirit of adoption, and says, "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in US [that is, the sons, the believers.] For the earnest expectation of *the creature* [rather *the creation*] waiteth for the manifestation of the SONS OF GOD. For the creature [the creation] was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the *creature* [the creation] itself ALSO *shall be delivered* from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of *the children of God*. For WE [the sons] know that *the whole creation* groaneth and travaileth in pain together till now. And *not only they*, but WE *ourselves* ALSO which *have the* FIRST FRUITS *of the Spirit*, even *we ourselves* groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." I have been particular in emphasizing these passages; and you will perceive that the words *also* and *first fruits*, as used by the Apostle, add peculiar force to the train of his reasoning.—The *sons*, who had the *first fruits* of the spirit; and the *creation*, which should *also* be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the same glorious liberty—embrace, in my estimation, the whole race of mankind.

Your remarks on Dan. xii, will be of no advantage to your argument, unless you show that our Saviour, in citing Daniel's prophecy, in Matt. xxiv, 15, 21, misapplied it to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Your reasoning on Rom. ii, 1—10, rests chiefly on the supposition that those verses contain a yet future reference. You say, "Here the apostle teaches, that there is a day of wrath and of the revelation of the righteous judgment of God *coming*." It should not be forgotten, that because a passage *when written*, had a future reference, it does not follow that it *still* has a future reference. You say, moreover, "Were it true that God now renders full and perfect retribution, there would be no occasion for promising what *he will do* on a future day, yet to be revealed. But I can not allow you to assume that "a future day, YET to be revealed," is spoken of in the passages before us. Paul certified that the things mentioned in the ten verses which, in your judgement, teach a retribution future to the present life, should be accomplished, "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men BY JESUS CHRIST, according to my gospel." In my last letter, on Acts xvii, 31, I endeavored to show that the day here mentioned was the reign of Christ in the kingdom appointed Him by the Father. "God has appointed a day in which He will judge the world BY THAT MAN whom He ordained." This declaration was future in its reference when written—for it pointed to the coming of the son of man in His kingdom. That coming was to be before the disciples had gone over all the cities of Israel, Matt. x, 23—before John's departure. John xxi, 22—before the generation in which Jesus lived, should have passed away, Matt. xxiv, 29—34.

When it is written that, under the gospel, God would judge the world BY JESUS CHRIST, are we to infer that *God* had not *previously* judged the world HIMSELF? When we are certified that God committed all judgment to the Son, are we to conclude that God had not previously exercised judgment in the earth? John v, 22—Jer. ix, 24—Ps. lviii, 2.

There can be no doubt that God will condemn the wicked—but it does not follow that He will condemn them to endless punishment. There can be as little doubt that the

Lord "will keep the feet of His saints, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness;" but it does not follow that you are correct, when you say, "this silence in darkness, I take to be a description of interminable gloom and despair." *I* take it to be a description of calamity *in the earth*.

You quote Job, xxi, 30—"The wicked are reserved to the day of destruction. They shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." And you add, "If the *present life* is the day of destruction, and the day of wrath, I see not how the wicked are reserved in this life to a future day of punishment." Answer: Korah and his company were reserved until the people had departed "from the tents of those wicked men"—and then the earth opened and swallowed them up, with all that appertained to them, Numbers, xvi. The Sodomites were reserved until Lot had departed from the city—then they were destroyed, together with all that grew upon the ground. Gen. xix. The antedeluvians were reserved until Noah and his family were safe in the ark—then came the day of destruction, and every living thing died that moved upon the face of the earth, Gen. viii. You thus perceive that the wicked are reserved to the day of destruction, and of wrath, in the present life.

When you allege that according to my views, "the wicked are reserved to salvation," you forget that there is such a thing as the *retort courteous*. I might say to you, that, according to *your* views, God was so *kind* to the saints of Israel, to righteous Lot, and to Noah, as not to permit them to be destroyed, in the judgments of which they were witnesses respectively—so *very kind* to them, that He was determined that they should linger a life of wretchedness in this evil world—and so *exceedingly gracious* to them ward, that He was not willing they should go to heaven, either by a gap in the earth, a flood of water, or of fire! I am satisfied that ridicule or satire, when properly used, is as lawful an argument, as is to be found in the vocabulary; but I wish not to use it, not even in self-defence, if I can avoid it. You have, however, resorted to this weapon; particularly in your remarks on the case of Judas, in connexion with a quotation from Ps. lxxiii, 18, 19—and you cannot reasonably find fault, if I should so far imitate your example, as to show that the sword of satire is a two-edged blade.

You say, in speaking of the death of Judas, "Happy man, to be thus translated to the abode of the spirits of the just made perfect!! You think Judas was *blessed* perfectly, so soon as he strangled himself. It must have been a *blessed woe*, then, which Christ pronounced on him; and thus you call evil good, and good evil."

Allow me to call your attention to a few cases recorded in Scripture. In Deut. xxxii, 48—52, it is thus written: "The Lord spake unto Moses that self-same day, saying, Get thee up into this mountain, and die in the mountain whither thou goest up, and be gathered unto thy people; as Aaron thy brother died in Mount Hor, and was gathered unto his people; BECAUSE YE TRESPASSED AGAINST ME among the children of Israel." Following your example, I might say, "Happy men, to be thus translated to the abodes of the spirits of the just made perfect, *because they trespassed* against the Lord! You teach, that Moses and Aaron, were *blessed* perfectly, so soon as they died. It must have been a *blessed punishment*, then, which God pronounced upon them; and thus you call evil good, and good evil."

In 2 Kings, xx, i, it is written that the good king Hezekiah was sick, nigh unto death—but God, as a token of favor added fifteen years to his life. Miserable man! to be kept out of heaven for fifteen years, as a favor!

Paul, in Phil. ii, 27, says, in speaking of his fellow laborer in the gospel, Epaphrodites, "For indeed he was sick nigh unto death; but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow." Cruel mercy! not to allow Epaphrodites to go to heaven! And how unfeeling was Paul, to say, that he should have had sorrow upon sorrow, if his fellow laborer had been so unfortunate as to have died and gone to heaven!

And now, dear sir, allow me to say, in all sincerity and affection, I regret having been under the necessity of thus plainly pointing out the results of your own reasoning. I humbly trust that circumstances of a like character will not again occur, in the progress of our friendly controversy.

Your *arguments* on the case of Judas, are 1st. John xvii, 12. "While I was with them (the disciples) in the world, I *kept* them in my name; those that thou gavest me I have *kept*, and none of them is *lost*, (apoleto,) but the son of *perdition* (apoleias;) that the Scripture might be fulfilled." But do you seriously suppose it was essential to the fulfilment of the Scripture, that Judas should be doomed to endless punishment? What is meant by Christ having hitherto kept his disciples in his Father's name? Plainly, that he had, as yet, preserved them faithful in his cause. What is meant by his having lost none? Simply that none, with the exception named, had abandoned it. What is meant by one being lost? Plainly nothing more than that one had abandoned the cause of Christ. You are aware that the words translated *lost* and *perdition* are the same, excepting that the former is the verb, and the latter the noun. "None of them is *lost* but the son of *perdition* that *the Scripture might be fulfilled*." The Scripture here noticed is Ps. xli, 9.—Jesus had quoted this Scripture in the early part of the evening. "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen; but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me," that is, he has become my adversary.

2d. You quote from Acts i—"that he might go to his own place." On this you should have attempted to show, 1st. That these words were spoken of Judas. Many of the best critics and commentators, Hammond, Gilpin, Clarke, etc. allege that they were spoken of Matthias, who was elected to fill the place vacated by the defection of Judas. 2d. That, even allowing the words to be spoken of Judas, "his own place" signified a state or place of endless punishment. I am not disposed to allow much force to inferences of an equivocal character. See Judges ix, 55. Numbers xxiv, 25.

3d. Your strongest argument is drawn from the Savior's declaration, "Good were it for that man if he had never been born." But it should be remembered that this was *a common proverb* among the Jews, and also among other nations. Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary on Acts i, quotes many examples from Schoettgen, which clearly show the Jewish use of the proverb to imply no more, than that such an one was a wretched, miserable creature. Koecher informs us, that "the very-phrase, *it is better not to be born*, is used by the best Greek authors to signify a miserable condition or calamity." Rosenmuller says that Gataker has quoted similar expressions from the heathen writers, both of Rome and of Greece.

But we need no other light than the Bible affords, on this subject. Solomon says, "If a man beget an hundred children, and his soul be not filled with good, and also that *he have no burial*, I say that *an untimely birth is better than he*." Eccl. vi, 3. See also Eccl. iv, 1—3. Job cursed the day of his birth, Job iii, 3—16, x, 18, 19. Jeremiah also, Jer. xx, 14—17—yet you do not suppose that either of these individuals was doomed to interminable wretchedness.

Should any of our readers feel disposed to examine this subject more minutely, they may consult Dr. Adam Clarke on Acts i—who, although an unwavering believer in, and an advocate of, the doctrine of endless punishment, declares his conviction "that there is no positive evidence of the final damnation of Judas in the sacred text." And I need scarcely add, that in the discussion of a question of so much importance as the one before us, nothing but positive evidence should be admitted.

I regret exceedingly that you have declined entering *fully* into an examination of some of the passages you have cited in proof of endless punishment. It is impossible to do entire justice to a dozen passages in any one letter. I am especially solicitous that you should consent to discuss 2 Thess. i, 6—10 in detail—inasmuch as you deem that passage "conclusive on the subject of our controversy," and inasmuch also as you say, it "must forever prevent you from becoming a Universalist.'

With many sincere wishes for your continued health and happiness, I am respectfully yours, &c.

AEL C. THOMAS.

Herald and Watchman.

Through indisposition at the time our last paper went to Press, and the usual hurry of those times, we neglected to say to the Subscribers of the "Herald and Watchman" that that number was the *last* we designed sending except to such as had, or should, especially order them. We have therefore concluded to forward still another, (the present one,) which will be last we shall send to any one on the list, except to such as we have already received, or may hereafter receive, express directions from to continue it.

We hope every one therefore desiring the "Messenger" to be continued them, will give us immediate notice thereof, for we shall regulate the extra edition, for them, to very near the number that may be ordered by our next, and consequently if their orders come late they will be liable to have a break in the course of their numbers. Such as have promptly given us returns will accept our thanks.

P.

☞ The desire to present our readers with the Discussion as early, and as much in connexion, as possible, must be an apology for the want of variety in the present and even some previous numbers. The Sermon of Br. Williamson, and the Vindication, on the 4th page, were both in hand for the present No. before it was known that we should have the Discussion in season. The *answers* to the 213 Questions, with Rejoinders, it will be seen are omitted this week. We shall probably give a large portion of them next week.

☞ It will be seen that the term for advance pay, expires with this No. *Immediate* returns must be made, if the subscriber expects to avail himself of them.

Our collector is now waiting on city patrons with their Bills. We hope they will arrange so as to give him as little trouble as possible in calling.—Our claim is small, and we need it promptly, in order to be prompt ourselves.

☞ For two weeks we have neglected to notice a new work proposed by Br. W. S. Balch, from the crowded state of our columns. We shall endeavor to copy his article in our next.

☞ The "Impartialist" complains that the "Messenger" is not received regularly. Br. Balch must scold Uncle Sam. The fault, (☞ *we know*,) is not with us.

PEWS IN ORCHARD-ST. CHURCH.

Persons desiring Pews, or Seats, in this church, can be accommodated by applying to the Sexton, on Sundays, at the church.

Conference at Good Luck.

A Universalist Conference will be holden in Potter's Meeting House, Good Luck, N. J. on Wednesday, May 21st. Means of conveyance will be provided by our friends at Hightstown and New-Egypt.

A. C. T.

PENNSYLVANIA CONVENTION.

The Pennsylvania Convention of Universalists will meet at Norristown, Montgomory Co. Pa. on Saturday morning, May 10, to continue in session two days. Ministering brethren are affectionately invited to attend.

JACOB MYERS,
Standing Clerk.

N. B. For the information of brethren at a distance, it may be proper to remark, that Norristown is situated on the banks of the Schuylkill, 15 miles N. W. of Philadelphia.

Died,

In this City on the 22d inst. Esther, daughter of Abraham J. Moore, aged 3 years.

Br. I. D. WILLIAMSON,

Will preach in this city to morrow on exchange with Br. Le Fevre. He will be at the Greenwich Church in the Morning, and at the Orchard st. Church in the afternoon and evening.

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach at Longridge, Sunday the 27th, and in the School house, near Deansville, the same evening, and in Saugatuck, Sunday May 4th.

Br. Robert Smith will preach at North Salem on Sunday the 27th inst.

Conference.—A conference of Universalists will be holden at Branchville, N. J. on the first Saturday and Sunday in May next. Ministering brethren are particularly invited to attend.

GEORGE ROGERS.

THANKSGIVING HYMN,

BY C. F. LE FEVRE.

Sung on the occasion of the Thanksgiving at the Orchard-st. and Greenwich Churches, on Sunday evening last.

Source divine of every blessing,
Songs of joy to Thee we raise,
Streams of grace our souls refreshing,
Swell our grateful hearts to praise.

Thou hast blest thy word with power,
Made thy truth to triumph *here*,
Brought the long desired hour,
Made thy own salvation *near*.

Eyes long sealed in mental slumber,
Wake and hail the gospel light,
Truths divine and without number
Burst upon the ravished sight.

Ears, on which the sound of sadness
Long her doleful peal has rung,
Listen to the notes of gladness,
By the gospel heralds sung.

Hearts, o'er which the spell of terror
Long has held her iron seat,
Fearless burst the bonds of error,
Shackles trample under feet.

For this great and free salvation,
Lord to thee our songs we raise,
May it spread thro' every nation,
'Till the world shall sound thy praise.

SPRING.

Who loves not Spring? Like many other subjects, the pomp and glory of Spring has been handled by so many writers, that its most prominent features cannot at this day be improved upon. Yet we like to cast a glance upon her as she passes, wreathed in her florid and redolent livery, and record our humble impressions.—It would be an endless task to bring forth all the similes that have been attached to Spring. She has been likened to the freshness of youth, ere the mildew of age had whitened along its juvenile blossoms, or the summer of manhood thrown a more serious aspect on the lineaments of the face. She has been likened to a strong man flinging the chains of slumber from his limbs, and rising up in his original power.—The bland sunshine and chilly showers of April, to the smiles and tears which mingle themselves in our sublunary cup—the first blue flower that points its chalice to the skies, and blooms beside the snow bank, to that affection which lives among the sterner aspects of life—the capricious winds to those deceptions which man often beholds—its first light, as the sun mounts over the hill tops, to the ardent youth as he launches forth upon the tide of life, and its exit at eve, as it falls crowned with crimson glory beneath the West, to the final departure of the virtuous to the long night of death.

We, too, have our impressions on this subject. We love the vernal season. There is a power in its beauty that gives a fresh impulse to our energies and send the purple tide of life leaping along its channels. We lay almost dormant during the reign of snows, the heavens hung in solemn drapery, and the winds piping a dreary music in our ears. Earth has not one inviting feature—we forget the wild beauty that hung around the cataract in the glen—we forget the sunny slope where the grass shone in a fadeless green—we forget the glassy lake where we launched our fragile boat—for Winter, stern Winter, comes savagely, and bids us cease our musings. But when Spring returns, these beauties one by one come back to the mind, and throw a feeling of delight over it.—The leaves of the forest put forth—the willows that fringe the brook begin to look green—flowers spring forth—the songs of birds begin with the first flash of morning—the dews descend—all, all assume a new life and strike us with a peculiar feeling. * * * * *

Again we say, we love Spring—we love the odor that floats on her gales—the music of her waters—her blue skies and soft sunshine.—Her stars are mellow and bright by night, and her moonlight pure and silvery. We will keep thee while we can, and hold a vigilant watch upon thee, even until thou fadest away into the ripening arms of Summer.—*Rural Repository.*

THE GOAT AND THE LAMB.

"What misery," said a pretty lamb, after he had cropped his fill of the tender grass in a sunny vale, and was reposing upon a velvet bed of scented clover—"what misery is mine! I am tired of this lazy valley, thus buried from all human observation. Here I can neither see nor be seen. They say that Providence has shed equal blessings upon the beings he has created. Forsooth, that is very well to talk about, but I will believe as much of it as I please. Blessings, indeed! what blessings? Here I am cooped up in a narrow valley, without any prospect, while yonder I see goats, who are no better than I, enjoying themselves wonderfully on the precipices—climbing the lofty crags, and overlooking, for what I know, all the world. Oh! that I might thus rise where I could survey a wider scene, and also where I could be viewed by all the creatures beneath, who would envy as well as admire me."

"Have thy wish," said Jupiter.

Immediately the discontented animal found himself elevated an immense distance above the plain, where he looked like a speck. The wind was here strong and chill, the earth barren and lonely; wild birds of prey screamed around. He stood trembling upon the edge of a giddy precipice, and already wishing but unable to descend. A hardy goat leaping near, the affrighted stranger thus addressed him:

"How is it that thou art fearless and happy in such a wild as this?"

"Alas!" said the goat, "I am not happy. I am a wretched creature, whom heaven has cruelly placed here in these dreadful wastes. I do not know what I have done to deserve it. True, I am formed to leap about from rock to rock; my feet, thou seest, are different from thine, and are constructed so as to receive no injury from the sharp crags. But I have often looked at the beautiful vale beneath, and upbraided Providence for not having placed me there."

Indeed, as the lamb gazed below upon his peaceful abode, he secretly acknowledged that it was lovely and happy, and that if he were once more there, he would never again abandon it. So, when ambition is even at the summit of its giddy height, and gazes upon the tranquil pleasures it has surrendered, they appear in the distance with new and enchanting beauty.

Something like these thoughts were gliding through the lamb's mind:

"I have learned a lesson, and experience, they say, is better than wealth."

But it may be sometimes too dearly bought; for at that instant a vulture, stooping from a cloud, seized the poor lamb in his talons, and bore him off bleeding to a yet higher cliff.—*N. Y. Mirror.*

BEAUTIFUL CONTRAST.

"Man might be initiated into the varieties and mysteries of needle work; taught to have patience with the feebleness and waywardness of infancy and to steal with noiseless steps around the chamber of the sick; and woman might be instructed to contend for the palm of science; to pour forth eloquence in senates, or to 'wade through fields of slaughter to a throne.' Yet revoltings of the soul would attend this violence to nature, this abuse of physical and intellectual energy; while the beauty of social order would be defaced and the fountain of earth's felicity broken up. We arrive, then, at the conclusion, that the sexes are intended for different spheres, and constructed in conformity to their respective destinations, by Him who bids the oak brave the fury of the tempest, and the alpine flower lean its cheek on the bosom of eternal snows. But disparity does not imply inferiority. The high places of the earth, with all their pomp and glory, are indeed accessible only to the march of ambition, or to the grasp of power; yet those who pass with faithful and unapplauded zeal through their humble round of duty, are not unnoticed by the 'Great Taskmaster's eye;' and their endowments, though accounted poverty among men, may prove durable riches in the kingdom of Heaven."

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves o every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a *world's reconciliation to God.*

An interesting Discussion between Rev. E. S. Ely, (Presbyterian) and A. C. Thomas, one of the editors, is now in progress in its columns.

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 2 years it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "*N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist,*" is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at $2 per annum, *in advance*, or $2,50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chesnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE. *Publisher and Proprietor.*

Beauties of Aminio-Calvinism.

Just published and for sale at this office, a neat 18 mo. pamphlet of 36 closely printed pages, entitled, "*The Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism; or, the story of Deacon Caleb Comfort, to which is added the vision of Deacon Peter Pious.*" This pamphlet comprises the five articles which have recently appeared in the columns of the Messenger, under the head *Five chapters on Partialism*, and are designed to exhibit the change which has come over the Presbyterian denomination within a few years. Price $4 per 100, or 6 cents single.

Brunswick Discussion.

Just received at this office, a "Report of the Discussion at Brunswick, June 17, between Rev. J. P. Kendall, and C. F. Le Fevre, to which is added a friendly letter to Rev. J. P. Kendall, by Henry J. Grew," For sale at the *very low price* of six cents or sixteen pages.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,
Nos. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham-Square.